



**Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)
January 19, 2010 9:30 -11:30 AM
Meeting Summary**

The meeting was attended by the following PAC members:

Emily Avery, Samtrans/Caltrain
Nancy Baer, Contra Costa Health Services
Michelle DeRobertis, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Tom Ford, City of Oakland resident
Eliot Hurwitz, Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency
Nathan Landau, AC Transit
Robert Planthold, San Francisco resident
David Simons, Sunnyvale resident
Russ Taft, Contra Costa County resident
Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority

In addition, the following non-members attended:

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks
Ina Gerhard, Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Coordinator

Agenda Items #1 & #2: Introductions and Review & Approval of Summary of Previous Meeting

The meeting began with self-introductions by attendees followed by a review of the summary from the previous PAC meeting on October 20, 2009.

The meeting summary was not approved at this meeting due to the fact that there was not a quorum until partway into agenda item #3. The quorum was lost before the return to the approval of the meeting summary at the end of this meeting.

Agenda Item #3 Presentation on Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM)
Presented by Marcia Arrant and Beth Thomas

Marcia started by explaining that the directive for complete streets (Deputy Directive 64-R-1) will be mainly covered in Chapter 8 of the PDPM and that a new Chapter 5 is being created that will focus on transportation planning and corridor issues.

Rochelle asked for a one-minute overview of the purpose of the PDPM. Marcia responded that, whether Caltrans, a local agency or a developer is doing a project, certain procedures have to be followed and the PDPM explains the requirements.

Rochelle then asked if the PDPM explains how to write a Project Initiation Document (PID). Marcia responded that the appendices to the PDPM do that.

Michelle asked whether the PDPM applies to all projects on the State Highway System and how a project is defined. Marcia responded that the PDPM does apply to all projects on the SHS, as well as connection points from the SHS, like to transit.

Marcia then explained that there are two types of revisions that are being done for the manual. One is a focused revision, which is done when there is a change or update in policy. This will consist of revisions to Chapters 5 and 8 for complete streets. The other type of revision being done is to the foundation chapters, which are old and obsolete. These are chapters 1, 2 and 3. A project team definition and team roles are being added to Chapters 2 and 3.

Marcia added that the Planning Scoping Checklist in Appendix L is also being revised.

Marcia also explained that, as DD 64-R-1 is incorporated into Chapter 8, staff will see what additional policies are still needed.

Nancy asked about the timeline of the PDPM. Marcia responded that the PDPM will be revised incrementally. As a policy gets approved, it will be incorporated into the manual in a focused revision.

Nancy then asked when something will be available for review and Beth asked a similar question relative to the PAC meeting schedule and the interest in DD 64 R-1. Marcia responded that Chapter 5 will be available in about 2 months and Chapter 8, which is the core chapter for DD 64-R-1, will be available in about 2 weeks. She explained that the revisions to Chapter 5 are on a different schedule because they are being handled by the Planning Division.

Tom asked a question about the timeline regarding Appendix L and Marcia responded that the Planning Scoping Checklist is a tool to determine deficiencies in the PID regarding transportation planning.

Marcia explained that the next steps are to circulate the PDPM to the Districts. She clarified that the PDPM is not used to create new policies and stated that it would be helpful to be informed about existing policies that are not currently in the PDPM.

Beth asked about the difference between a Project Team and Project Development Team. Marcia responded that the difference is that a Project Team provides data information while the Project Development Team makes decisions. Beth informed Marcia that District 4 does not make a distinction between the two.

Beth then gave her portion of the presentation, covering an outline she had prepared on the treatment of walking and bicycling in the PDPM. This presentation focused largely on the importance of the purpose and need statement and the difference between items covered in this statement and those only covered in the project scope, namely that project features only reflected in the latter can be dropped from the project as it is being further developed or if a funding shortfall develops. Beth explained that the guidance on Purpose and Need Statements in the PDPM does not require that these statements reflect the needs of all modes of transportation at the project location, but instead states that “secondary” needs should be left out of the statement and instead addressed only in the project scope. Beth also pointed out the Chapter 31, the Nonmotorized Transportation Chapter, still has language from the old version of DD 64, before revision 1 (before DD 64-R-1).

Michelle asked whether Chapter 31, the Nonmotorized Transportation Chapter, needs revisions in addition to Chapter 8 and why this topic is covered in Chapter 31 rather than Chapter 9. Marcia noted this comment.

Wendy stated that she wanted to suggest that the PDPM indicate that, everywhere one sees the word, “transportation,” in the Purpose and Need Statement for a project, the statement should include the language, “which addresses the multimodal transportation deficiency.”

Nathan commented that the transit facilities list in the PDPM is incomplete and that the inclusion of “bus turnouts” is not helpful because transit agencies have moved away from supporting these because they hurt transit operations. He said that the list should include pedestrian access.

A motion was then introduced to ask that the points in Beth’s presentation be considered by Headquarters staff working on revisions to the PDPM as the comments of the District 4 PAC.

Agenda Item #4 Update on ADA Legal Settlement

Presented by Jeff Wiley, Caltrans

Jeff began by stating that Charles Wahnnon is the Caltrans ADA Program Manager and Walter Menda will be taking Jeff’s place as ADA Infrastructure Program Manager.

Jeff explained that the settlement agreement reached preliminary approval on December 22, 2009 and that there is a 30 day period used in the fairness hearing. The final hearing is expected to be in Spring 2010.

Jeff added that the terms of the settlement call for spending \$1.1 Billion over 30 years on ADA infrastructure improvements. Of this, \$25 million would be spent each year in the first five years, \$35 million each year for the next ten years, \$40 million each year for the next ten years after that, and \$45 million each year for the last five years.

Jeff clarified that new pedestrian facilities would be funded from already existing programs and that the funding resulting from the settlement agreement is for retrofits of existing pedestrian facilities.

David asked how the project list will come out. Jeff responded that every District has an ADA transition plan and is updating it. The access request and complaint process is another way to determine what is fixed. The transition plan's priority is 1. Safety, 2. Facilities by local government, and 3. Corridors that are heavily used.

Bob asked who approves the process, for clarification on how one can complain, and what defines an existing project versus a future project. Jeff replied that the approval will come through the Federal Court and that the court will look at input from the fairness hearing. He added that Charles Wahnnon is the Statewide ADA Coordinator. Charles accepts complaints and tracks them. The Districts perform the investigation. Current projects are those that have already been identified and future projects are those that need to go through scoping.

Wendy asked whether, if there is an existing state highway in a city scheduled for reconstruction that is lacking sidewalks at a bus stop, it would be considered a new project. Jeff replied that each situation is evaluated on a project-by-project basis. Wendy commented that Caltrans should define projects categorically with some parameters.

Eliot asked when implementation of the ADA Legal Settlement timeline would begin. Jeff stated that the 1st fiscal year of implementation will be the first year after final approval of the settlement agreement.

Agenda Item #5 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD)

Beth described the major improvements in guidance for pedestrians included in the newly released 2009 national MUTCD and the timeline and process for updating the CA MUTCD based on the national 2009 MUTCD. California has until 1/15/12 to review the 2009 MUTCD and determine which items will be incorporated into the CA MUTCD. This will occur through formal action by the California Traffic Control Devices Committee and Caltrans.

Wendy commented that the University of California, Berkeley, Safe Transportation Research and Education Center (SafeTREC) has requested that the California Office of Traffic Safety start experimenting with rectangular rapid flashing beacons. Jill Cooper is the contact for that.

Agenda Item #6 Adopted California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guideline Amendments

Beth covered the changes to the CEQA Checklist in appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. She explained that language has been added at the top of the appendix clarifying that the checklist has sample questions, but that local agencies are not required to use them literally. Beth also covered the changes in the wording of the transportation questions that have made them more multimodal.

Agenda Item #7 Updates on Policies/Guidance/Studies/Projects Previously Presented

Complete Streets (DD 64-R-1) Implementation Plan – Beth explained that a technical advisory committee (TAC) has been formed to complement the Steering Committee. Adoption of the Implementation Plan is expected by 1/28/10.

California Highway Design Manual (HDM) Multimodal Revision Process – Beth stated that the HDM chief expects to have a draft in May and final in June.

Announcements

Wendy announced that the MTC Pedestrian Safety Summit was scheduled for January 29, 2010. The event topics were to be: Complete Streets, Safe Routes to Schools, Funding Opportunities, Health Benefits, Estimating Pedestrian Trips and Pedestrian Safety Audits. Also, Wendy announced that the Moving Children Safely Conference was coming up on March 14-16 in Burlingame. Lastly, the MTC Policy Advisory Council will have its first meeting on April 14, 2010.

Topics for Next Meeting

Rochelle addressed the matrix in the agenda packet on future meeting topics. Items that were suggested for coverage at the next meeting were the findings from the National Household Travel Survey California Add-On, the results of the SafeTREC survey of public agency and Caltrans bicycle and pedestrian coordinators, and the Caltrans new draft guidance on reconstruction of intersections and interchanges for pedestrians and bicyclists.